Vol. I. No. 4.

YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY.

Published by
The Students of the Divinity School of Yale University.

MARCH, 1905.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PHILLIPS BROOKS AND THE YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL, ... 109
PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER.

THE INCARNATION AS A REVELATION OF GOD, ... 116
GERALD H. BEARD, PH.D.

WHY BE A MINISTER? 130
FERDINAND Q. BLANCHARD, '01.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A COURSE OF READING ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT, . . 134
PROFESSOR GEORGE B. STEVENS.

THE DEAN'S LETTER—MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES—SEMINARY NEWS—THE ALUMNI. 138

Entered as second-class matter May 26th, 1904, at the Post Office at New Haven, Conn., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

The Theological Department

OF

YALE UNIVERSITY

(The Yale Divinity School)

Offers exceptional opportunities for regular and special instruction for theological students, or for those who desire to lay a broad foundation for the work of teaching.

The eighty-third year began September twenty-ninth.

For information address the Dean of the Faculty,

PROF. FRANK K. SANDERS,

Drawer 4, Yale Station.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

VOL. I. MARCH, 1905. No. 4.

PHILLIPS BROOKS AND THE YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL.

PROFESSOR GEORGE P. FISHER.

IN what is now the long list of lecturers in the annual course on preaching in the Yale Divinity School, it might be thought by some invidious to say that Phillips Brooks was, on the whole, the most successful. It is safe to say, at least in my judgment, that his course has been excelled by none in merit and attractiveness. That he has left behind no other writing more worthy of praise, is the verdict of not a few of his most judicious admirers. He entered on his task with a clear appreciation of the idea of the founder of the course, which was that it should interweave really, if not formally, the lessons instilled by the lecturer's personal experience in the ministry. In his opening lecture, Mr. Brooks remarked that he had felt that it would give him pleasure to define, for himself as well as for others, the principles as to preaching by which he had half-consciously been working and living for many years. Of that first lecture I take the liberty to observe that of the numerous discourses on this foundation to which I have listened, no one of them, not excepting the lectures by Beecher and Dale, has impressed me more than that. It was stored with invaluable thought, lucid and compact in tone, and in spirit was faultless. He stated his purpose to be to set forth two essential elements in preaching. He made the end of preaching to be the communication of truth by man to men. The two elements, he said, are "truth and personality." These may be mingled in different proportions. Christ chose this method of spreading the Gospel through the world. That truth, he went on to say, is personal; "Christianity is Christ"—but conveyed through personality. Preaching *is* truth conveyed through per-

sonality. Preparation for the ministry is *the making of a man*—his whole nature. This is the perpetual function of the pulpit. "The age," the lecturer affirmed, "has no aversion to preaching as such." The *matter* of Christian preaching is a message given us for transmission; but a message which we cannot transmit until it has entered into our own experience, and we can give our own testimony to its spiritual power. Mr. Brooks easily guarded against exaggeration by adding that since preaching is a message, it puts us into right relations with all historic Christianity. One who takes his own ideas "not as a message of God but as his own discoveries, has cut himself off from the message-bearing church of all ages." Two characteristic tendencies of the time were pointed out: (1) the tendency of criticism, to wit, the tendency to deal with things in an external way, by discussion, etc., not putting ourselves in their power; (2) the tendency of mechanism, with instrumentality—the church and its instrumentalities. Preaching is talk to individuals. The Church is for the soul. The final cause of preaching, i. e. its end and aim, is for men's salvation. But there must be a right idea of salvation. What are you to save men from? Avoid a narrow conception—as punishment, or "for the elevation of society." Preaching was declared to be "the living force of the human soul brought to bear upon living souls, for the sake of their transformation." Mr. Brooks cautioned against the disparagement of dogmatic theology. The element of personalty was said to involve the individuality of every preacher. There may be a bad effect of familiarity with thoughts and minds of others. The preacher must open his own personality for its transmissive work, "by the opening of his life on both sides—toward the truth of God and the needs of man." *Truth* is the fixed, stable element; *personality* the varying and growing element. A poise and proportion of the two elements is possible. The decay of the personal element is the experience of old men; the slighting of absolute truth the danger of young men. The first lecture of Mr. Brooks was a masterly union of the catholic spirit, broad and comprehensive, with needed discrimination—with negatives by way of caution.

In conjunction with the discourse of Mr. Brooks, it is natural to advert to the highly instructive opening lecture of Henry

Ward Beecher, in which the office of the preacher—that of a "fisher of men"—is insisted upon and finely illustrated.

One may see in the first lecture of Mr. Brooks some of his characteristic traits. His religious teachings in the pulpit and out of it reflected, and never went beyond, his own experience, his own assimilation, if one may so style it, of what he experienced. Where the line of his inward perception and heartfelt convictions stopped, he stopped. All that he taught, all that he averred, was stamped with sincerity. All who knew him recognized this gold in his character. A certain reserve characterized him in his youth. It never wholly forsook him. It is said of him by early friends that "he did not let himself out in conversation, yet early or late there was no evidence of a struggle with doubt. Moreover he showed then, as in mature life, the capacity of being aroused into a glowing enthusiasm." His sonnets and other verses were one proof of this. His reticence was a kind consistent with frankness and perfect candor. Neither in private converse nor in church assemblies did he ever spread a cloak over his opinions. And he was never a stranger, certainly never hostile, to pleasantry and merriment.

Mr. Brooks's lectures were delivered in 1879. Before I went to Boston to convey to him the invitation, I had heard expressions of great doubt as to the probability, so busy a man as he was said to be, of his acceptance of it. But he expressed at once an inclination to comply with the request, and shortly after decided to do so. When the course was finished, none of us were willing to part with him as a lecturer, finally. In answer to my earnest solicitations, in accord with the wishes of all of us, he was always desirous to come. His visits to my home were seasons destined ever to remain fresh in my memory. But too soon he found an obstacle in the way, which became more and more serious, from his parochial and other professional labors. I venture to insert here a number of his letters, in which he explains the conflict of feeling thus occasioned. I owe an apology to my readers for putting into print these unstudied communications, disclosing as they do our mutual friendship and regard. With this apology, I venture to do so for the reason that they present artless discoveries of his sense of duty, mingled with personal kindness and warmth of feeling, along with glimpses of his delightful humor.

Under date of Jan. 30, 1879, he begins with regret that he cannot at once fix a time when he could come and lecture. He refers to the "broken winter," to his having been very busy—

* * * "even parish duties neglected in a way which makes me wretched. But now I am really getting to work. Only I have to go to Philadelphia in February for some lectures, and then comes Lent, which, as a good Congregationalist, you well know, begins on the 26th of February. Some time during Lent—or perhaps immediately after, I may be able to come and may have something to say. You see I am unwilling to give up what has been before so great a pleasure."

He concludes thus, referring to the death of his father:

"I thank you for your kind words of sympathy, with all my heart. One needs all his friendships to tie him to the interests of life when such a tie is suddenly broken. Believe me always, gratefully yours,

PHILLIPS BROOKS."

Under date of Jan. 17, 1880, with two photographs of himself, sent at my request, he says that if he refused he

"should be putting a most unreal value on them. The picture of yourself which I carried off last year is still among my treasures, and I shall be glad if this which I send you ever recalls me as pleasantly to your thought. . . . . I am having the quietest and busiest of winters. It would give me the greatest pleasure to see you in Boston. Do not come ever without letting me know that you are here—and if you can stand a bachelor's hospitality, there shall always be a welcome for you. Thank you for your kind words about the Lectures. I never see the volume on the shelf without remembering the cordial welcome and pleasant days I had at Yale."

The following is an extract from a letter of Mr. Brooks, accepting an invitation to lecture:

"March 21, 1880.

"Indeed I think that I ought to give you fair warning that I have found my visits to New Haven so uniformly and extremely pleasant that I shall probably accept every invitation that I get to lecture there again. So you must not ask me unless you want me. I shall most gladly come for two lectures some time next winter and will let you know when I can see what they will be about."

Reply to a note respecting the promised lectures:

"Oct. 21, 1881.

DEAR DR. FISHER:

Your note covers me with confusion. I have been meaning all the week to write to you and say in what complete despair I am about the possibility of lecturing this winter. The summer is past and was so taken up in most unexpected ways that I find myself totally destitute of any prepa

ration for the work, and now I am launched into a winter that promises to be—indeed already is—covered with work as no winter ever has been before in my short life. I have my Mission Parish thrown upon my hands besides my own Church, and every day finds its work only half done at the end.

What can I do? I am ashamed to ask to be let off again. But I realize very strongly that henceforth I must not undertake anything except what belongs strictly to Trinity Church in Boston.

But this is already undertaken, and if I could see the slightest possibility of doing it, I would not shirk—I confess that I do not, and so, with all my shame, I have nothing else to do. Can you let me off? That is what I have been meaning to write and ask you all this week, and your note leaves me no chance of delaying the humiliating question any longer.

I want to come,—though, in truth, most duties away from home attract me less and less. I am getting to feel myself not more fit for any work here but less fit for everything else every year.

I know that you will do all that you can to meet my necessities and so I put my humble petition in your hands.

What a year of losses this has been—Washburne,* Diman,† Vinton,‡ Stanley!§ How much poorer the world is with such men gone!

Most shamefacedly but faithfully yours,

PHILLIPS BROOKS."

Extract relating to a promised lecture:

"Febr. 25, 1882.

. . . . . the old story: Writer so busy with the occupations of the parish.

And here is Spring and Lent, and I would not stand up in that pleasant chapel of yours before all those fellows, who look so ready to be attentive, without something to say, for all the world.

My staying away, if they could know the reason of it, would perhaps be as suggestive a lecture as I could give them if I shut myself up a month to get ready. It would mean, 'When you have nothing to say, don't speak!'"

I think that it was at this time that, on hearing that several students had entered the Divinity School in order to hear him lecture, Mr. Brooks chose to come and fulfill the expectation, much to the satisfaction of the audience which, as usual when he spoke, filled Marquand Chapel.

Further extracts respecting lectures:

* Rev. Edward A. Washburne, D. D., Rector of Calvary Church, New York City.
† Rev. J. Lewis Diman, D. D., Professor in Brown University.
‡ Rev. Alexander Vinton, D. D.
§ Rev. A. P. Stanley, D. D., Dean of Westminster.

"Febr. 26, 1884.

DEAR DR. FISHER:

It is most pleasant to hear from you again, and all sorts of pleasant recollections start up at the sound of your voice, and I am much pleased that you want me to lecture again: especially as I have a lurking remembrance that I did pretty shabbily the last time. . . . . ."

The next extract refers to the report that Mr. Brooks was to become a Professor at Harvard:

"The Cambridge report has no foundation. If I go there it will be only to preach, not to deliver lectures.

So I think you must excuse me and drop me from your plans and let me come to spend a quiet night with you some time without lecturing. May I? . . . . ."

"Dec. 26, 1885.

I look back to my lecturing visits to New Haven as among my pleasantest experiences and I would most gladly repeat them if I could. But I find that every year the opportunity for any work outside of my parish grows less and less. In 1879 I was comparatively an idle man. Now, I am fully occupied and cannot at all keep up with the work I ought to do. I live in a maelstrom of unceasing self-reproach. This New Year finds me overcome with penitence and despair. . . . . And so I must not do it. And I am very grateful to you for asking me. You will give me credit, I know, for absolute sincerity, and will ask some one else who is less busy or more capable.

Not least among my regrets is that which I feel at losing the chance of seeing more of you of whom I see so little."

Humorous extract from Mr. Brooks's letter of thanks for a copy of my Dudleian Lecture at Harvard University on the "Validity of Presbyterian Ordination."

"Dec. 28, 1888.

. . . . . I shall show it to all the Bishops I can get to read it, and shall carry it with me to the next General Convention. I hope that it set right any weak tendencies towards Episcopacy which were moving in President Eliot or any other of the Cambridge people."

"January 16, 1889.

. . . . . You are very good indeed to want some more of my poor lecturing, and, poor as I think it to be, destitute as I know it is of all the beautiful arts which make lectures popular, I would yield to your kind wishes and come most gladly if I could. But indeed I cannot. . . . ."

"Among the very pleasantest of my recollections are my visits at your house and my appearances in Marquand Chapel years ago. It is always a temptation when one is asked to repeat an old pleasure. But it is generally a delusion and a snare. I do not believe there are any more lectures

in me. And so, even if I were a perfect Vanderbilt in the matter of time, it would not be good to try it.

But my other reason is enough. I really cannot stand any more of neglect of immediate duty than I am allowing myself now. I am afraid of getting reconciled to it. That depth of degradation I have so far escaped.

And so you must still look to idle boys like Hall* and Taylor,† and believe that I thank you with all my heart for the desire which you have so kindly and cordially expressed.

Forgive me if I have said too frivolously what I feel most seriously, and count me ever

Faithfully and gratefully yours,
PHILLIPS BROOKS."

"Dec. 20, 1892.

. . . . . I hope that you are very well and I miss the days when I was in the habit of seeing you as I do not now."

Bishop Brooks had not the vigorous constitution which his robust appearance in his mature years would seem to indicate. After he entered upon the work of the ministry and was a rector in Philadelphia, his intellectual activity and parochial labors were apt to exceed the bounds of his physical strength. More than once in his life he owed an increase of health and energy to travels abroad. After leaving Philadelphia and becoming rector of Trinity Church, Boston, his health was more and more imperiled, as time went on, by the number and variety of the public addresses, far and near, not to speak of unspoken contributions in print, which his own impulses and sympathy moved him to consent to make—not to take account here of social engagements—in response to appeals from within and without his own Christian communion. The result was a gradual weakening of the resources of strength, of which he could only be slowly conscious. His life continued, after he was elected Bishop (April 30, 1891) until Jan. 23, 1893, less than two years. To those who knew him and occasionally met him, it was not the presence of any malady, but rather a sense of weariness on his part, at different times more or less distinct, that manifested itself and was now and then avowed. The career of Bishop Brooks was

* Rev. John Hall, D. D., Pastor of Presbyterian Church, Fifth Avenue. New York City.

† Rev. William M. Taylor, D. D., Pastor of Broadway Tabernacle (Congregational) Church, New York City.

an unceasing, uncomplaining, unselfish service of God and his fellow men. The deep love and reverence of the multitude of these still living, is one of the varied testimonies to his worth.*

* The writer would add as a note that in his judgment the Biography of Bishop Brooks by Rev. Prof. A. V. G. Allen, D.D., contains ample materials for obtaining a thorough acquaintance with the subject of the Biography.

THE INCARNATION AS A REVELATION OF GOD.*

GERALD H. BEARD, PH.D.

IN this paper I shall try simply to make two points :—first, The Incarnation, as a revelation of God, means that God is in his world ; second, It means that God's supreme revelation of himself to men is through a man.

1. The Incarnation, as a revelation of God, means that God is in his world. That is the fundamental truth that underlies the religious experience of the fatherhood of God involved in the sonship of Jesus Christ. Philosophically, it is the necessary presupposition that God and the world, and therefore God and man, are fundamentally identical, in the identity of a unitary real Being and that Being's states of consciousness. It seems to me the author of The Christ of Today is mistaken when he says that, "The fact that Christ's nature is rooted in the Deity * * * is the sole adequate support for belief in * * * the kinship between man and his Maker." That, indeed, is essential to the very thought of incarnation. It is the affirmation, not merely of Jesus' sayings, but of himself. For that affirmation was not, primarily, I tell you the truth, I give you life, I do good deeds ; but, I am the truth, I am the life, I am the Son of God. Yet the reason the Incarnation means more today than ever, is that, in the light of the philosophy of science and the philosophy of history, it may be seen to be, not an isolated phenomenon, but

* A paper read at the anniversary exercises of the Yale Divinity School, in June, 1904.

the presentation and re-enforcement in a holy human life, of the normal and abiding relation of God to his world as its indwelling Soul.

This is so fundamental to a reasonable appreciation of the Incarnation, that I must remind you, with a hint or two, of those elementary philosophical approaches to the truth of a personal, indwelling God, with which we all are familiar, yet for lack of reckoning with which so much that is utterly irreconcileable with modern thought is still taught as the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. Perhaps one may state it clearly, though very inadequately, as follows. Take the world of things first. Modern science finds all things to be reducible to terms of force, or modes of motion. Here is a table. It may be destroyed by fire. A handful of wood ashes remains perceptible. Most of the atoms of what we knew as "table" have entered into new combinations with myriads of atoms of the oxygen of the atmosphere, forming new though perhaps invisible substances, while a considerable amount of energy has been set free, as is evidenced in the heat given off from the burning table. And the sum of all that is lost in one form equals the sum of all that is gained in other forms. Now all such manifestations of force as heat, light and sound, are found to be ultimately convertible into one another. Out of this has come the great law, or probable generalization that, however the forms of energy change, the total is conserved unimpaired. The necessary implication here, and along similar lines of evidence, seems to be a unitary world force.

When we turn from finite things to finite persons like ourselves, we find ourselves as subjects of psychical states, known to ourselves better than anything else,—I am, thinking, feeling, willing. On reflection, one finds that the self known to consciousness, is related to its own conscious states. The subject I is not the states, such as thought, feeling, volition, nor the states the subject. They are related. So of other persons and things. They appear related to their states of being. But more, they are related to me. I am not they, nor they I. Elementary relations, as of subject and object, of space and time, of cause and effect, bind us together. What, then, is the ultimate reality, or real subject, of *all* these relations, of *all* persons and things? Is there One Resident Consciousness, elsewhere thought as One Resident

Force? Here again, thought points to One in which, or whom, all finite realities exist, an Infinite Subject of all states of Being, whose states all finite persons and things must be conceived to be. To say that this is only the taking out in reality of what we have put into thought, is to deny the validity of experience where experience is most immediate,—that is, knowledge rooted in self-consciousness.

Agnosticism as to the reality of this Absolute Subject, or as to its intelligent and righteous personality, is the prevalent form of scepticism, and we must have a word with that, for in ancient or modern form, it has been the *bête noire* of the doctrine of the Incarnation even within Church circles. Its overshadowing influence of late, dates back to Immanuel Kant. With him it says, 'We can study only phenomena, or manifestations. Of real being, the thing-in-itself, we can know nothing, save that it is; what it is, is altogether beyond human knowledge.' But what is this chasm which Kant posited between the thing-in-itself and phenomena? A bare abstraction of thought, and equal to nothing. You take a thing, and, in thought, divest it of its qualities. These, as Kant rightly showed, are what they are to your own consciousness. Then you imagine what the thing is without any qualities, out of all relation. You call it the thing-in-itself. Of course you cannot know it so. You have projected it, in thought, out of all real relations to yourself. You have divested it of the very qualities, or attributes, in which only it itself is, and through which it may become known. And then you deny your knowledge of reality, because you have rejected the one approach to reality possible to human reason. So of all being. How do I know the reality of water-in-itself? The reality of water-in-itself is absolutely nothing. Water, as it appears —now as solid ice, now as fluid water, now as the gases hydrogen and oxygen—I know: and that *is* water. So I know God. He is not an abstraction of Greek or German thought, bereft of all qualities. He is as he manifests himself through phenomena—that is, by the way in which he appears, in physical nature, in history, in the communion of the spirit.

The modern approach to belief in the full personality, the intelligence and goodness of the Supreme Being, I do not need to indicate. The point I make here is simply that modern phil-

osophy, when it does reach a real knowledge of God, necessarily finds him an immanent God, a God immediately and intimately related to man. An absentee God, a God separated from his creation, an interfering God, there is no room for. But God in his world, the Real Subject of all states, whether things or men ; the Resident Force of all resident forces, the Intelligence behind all intelligences ; the Good above all goods, Eternal Love, we do need and we do find.

The words " immanent " and " transcendent " are often on our lips as descriptive of God. Yet, ' within ' and ' without ' are of course spacial terms which easily become misleading. 'It is as true to say, as the Scriptures say, that we are in God, as to say, with them also, that God is in us. God *in* his world, a resident force, the immanent God, means simply that God must be thought as the real subject of all finite states of being, whether things or persons, and that, in relation to these states of being, he always acts in accordance with that determined order which we find, in fact, characterizes them. God's transcendence means simply that this Real Subject of all states, whether modes of motion or of consciousness, is not to be resolved into those states, but is known through them. This Soul of the Universe is not the universe : is not merely matter extended in space ; does not come to consciousness only in man, but is personal spirit. If self-consciousness and self-determination are personal, and involve personality, then God is personal.

As every student of the history of the doctrine of the Incarnation knows, the philosophical presuppositions in the midst of which that doctrine took shape, were the precise opposites of all this. There was, indeed, in the first place, the necessity men felt to account for the unique personality and worth of Jesus. But, coupled with this, and quite as formative for the doctrine of the Incarnation, was the dominant *a priori* thought of God, as a remote and individuated king or national father, from whom the most that could be expected was an occasional theophany (so the Hebrew), or else as a bare abstraction, infinitely separated from, and, as some said, unrelated to, the universe (so the Greek). It is probable that both of these conceptions affected the Apostle Paul's doctrine of Christ as a Mediator, and it is still more probable that one phase of the Greek philosophy gave form to the

Logos doctrine of the Prologue of the Gospel of John. This tendency was, of course, far stronger in the more speculative theology of the early Church Fathers. To Ignatius, the Divine Father is "timeless and viewless;" to Justin, "incomprehensible, unnameable and incapable of suffering;" to Clement of Alexandria, "unknowable and incapable of revelation, except in the Son;" to Hippolytus, beyond all predicates of "movement, change or conversion;" to Eusebius of Cesarea, "too high to create the world,—it could not bear him." When we come to Origen, it would be hard to recognize in his description of the Father God, the Divine Father of Jesus' teaching. According to Origen, the Father is *Τὸ ὄν*, simple Being, not only absolutely "indivisible and unchangeable," but accurately speaking, "above will, spirit or reason; for these cannot be attributed to him without admixture of sensuous impurity."

The doctrine of the Incarnation, as an incarnation of the Logos, or Second Person of the Trinity, was part of the product of this philosophy. It was an attempt, urged both by the demands of the intellect and by the yearnings of the heart, to bridge the chasm thus created between God and man, with an altogether unique revelation of one who truly shared in deity, was *Θεὸς*, but yet was not *ὁ Θεὸς*, the Absolute God. In the New Testament, and from Ignatius to Athanasius, there obtained, of course, all degrees of thought subordinating the person of Jesus to the person of God. Yet it was only needful for this subordination to be obscured, and the divine "persons" (who before Augustine were prevailingly believed to be persons in the usual sense) to become thought of as three mysterious and unknowable modes of the Divine Being, while yet the name "persons" was retained and the Three were counted co-equal Persons in one God, to insure, in time, as bald a tritheism as that that is dominant in popular theology today, outside a small circle of our Congregational Sabellian philosophers.

I suppose it is well within the limits of probability to say that, dear to religious experience as are the truths that lie beneath the Trinitarian doctrine, the persistent use of the phrase "Three Persons in one God," has done more to rob the people of an immediate and ennobling consciousness of the personality of the one indwelling God, which is the dearest truth philosophy is conserving, than all that the spectres of pantheism have done.

Kant's fatal practice of separating God from his world through an identification of the abstractions of thought with the realities of being, paved the way for that most fascinating, yet, after all, non-Christian product, the Hegelian dialectical Trinity. This lent new confidence to that doctrine of the Incarnation which made the Logos the only knowable God and the soul of Jesus. A sounder philosophy is saying to us today: Whether dealing with finite things or persons, or with the Infinite Person, your mind can abstract, for purposes of thought, those permanent states known as qualities or attributes of the subject; but to suppose that, therefore, in reality, there ever was a thing-in-itself, a central core or substance, apart from and unrelated to its states or modes of being, is purely your imagination. A thing is as it acts. God is what he manifests himself to be in all those states or modes of his consciousness among which we have our being. As such, what shall hinder our knowing him and receiving his gracious influences through an Incarnation?

The existence therefore of this chasm between God and man, which the Hellenic *a priori* philosophy created, and Kant's Critique recreated, and which the early form of the doctrine of the incarnate Logos and the Hegelian speculation sought to bridge, is precisely what the more careful thinking of our day denies. In so far as that denial is just, the form of the Incarnation doctrine based on it becomes obsolete. To be sure, man is not God, in the sense of being the Infinite Ego, or Real Subject of all states of being known as things and persons. Yet, as a person, man is one of these states or modes of God. As such, he has his being in God, and God is in him.

The Incarnation becomes, then, a real revelation, or unveiling, of God in his world, as he is normally and eternally when unhindered by sin in man. And this is a revelation of God himself. To satisfy the soul's needs this Revealed One must be nothing less than "all the fullness of the Godhead."

2. But Paul said, "all the fullness of the Godhead *bodily*." That brings me to my second point, which is that God's supreme revelation of himself to men is through a man.

The philosophical position that underlies this belief may be stated as follows. Man, who, as we have seen, is identical with God in the identity of the states of a being's consciousness with

that being's real subject or ego, is yet differentiated from God in three ways. First, as a state of the Infinite Subject of states. For, while the Infinite Subject never exists in reality except in and through his own states, and while these states are always his states, and men, therefore, are always in God and of God, yet this Subject is not the states nor the states the Subject. Second, as a relative personality. The one complete personality, the Infinite Spirit, has given to man, in a limited measure of freedom of self-determination, and in a limited sort of self-consciousness, a relative personality, through which, while yet a state of Absolute Being, man is personal spirit. Third, and abnormally, as a sinning person, in whose sin the finite personal subject cuts himself off from conscious and harmonious unity with the Infinite Subject, the Supreme Spirit, and so cuts himself off from life and happiness.

This last differentiation of man from deity—that of the sinning soul—we may leave out of account at this point; but the first and second—that of man as a state of the Infinite Real Subject, and that of man as a person—need to be fixed clearly in mind.

The first fact to be marked about man is, evidently, that he is a part of what we call the natural order. Man is an animal, a mammal, a species descended, not, of course, as is popularly said, from a monkey, but from some ancestor which was also ancestor to the anthropoid apes. So far, and even recognizing the natural affection and gleams of sympathy and self-denial in many of the lower animals, we must count man as simply a sharer with all other non-human things in that differentiation from deity which belongs to things. He is a state, or mode, of the Infinite Being. It is important to bear in mind what this involves. For man's animal body determines his personality not less certainly than his soul does. He is not only still connected with it through his brute ancestry; but this body, and particularly its nervous system, is (for earth at least) the inseparable basis of his higher life. Although states of consciousness are essentially different from the changes in the nerve cells and fibres that are correlated with them, the two are correlated,—to a considerable extent with specific lobes of the brain; and, without exception, with its constituent quality, structure and health.

But now, a vast difference, often carelessly minimized, exists between the highest non-human animal and man. In man the really distinctive marks of personality appear:—first, self-consciousness: reflective knowledge of one's self as self, including the power to interpret one's self and one's place in nature; and second, self-direction: including the pursuit of an ideal, the power to attach to things and events and persons moral worth and to choose among them. Here man rises, at his best, into the higher regions of personal spiritual life, where he dwells alone with God.

It has been said that this finite personality is relative, and not absolute as God's personality must be believed to be. For, first, man's self-consciousness is reached only through his consciousness of the world without him, and is completed only in his God-consciousness; whereas, by the very terms of infinity, the self-consciousness of God must be conceived to find all its completeness in himself. The mode of human self-consciousness is incidental simply to its development, and due to the limitations of all finite being. Then, second, and more important still, man's freedom in self-determination, though real, is only partial.

The most thorough-going libertarian must admit that human action is largely determined absolutely without any choice on the man's part. And if, as I believe could be shown, were space sufficient, the freedom of choice a man does have, is in its last analysis a freedom of determining *what* he does through determining *when*, under the stress of motives, he does it, then every act of man, except only sin, which is essentially a negation of the real or divine order, is an act of God in the soul of man.

Human personality, then, is limited in both its aspects. Enough, however, is given in this relative personality for the basis of a true moral, spiritual life. Man does not cease to be, in common with all finite existences, a state of the Mind or Soul of the universe. Yet he is "made in the divine image," endowed with relative personality; and therefore, to the relation of dependence which binds him to God, is added for him the relation of communion.

If what has been said is true, it seems clear to one man at least, that it follows that the highest revelation of God to men that can be thought, not only could be, but must be made through

a true man. Not through "humanity," as distinguished from individual man (I have no notion of what humanity apart from some man may be); but through a true man. Not through a person called man, the very centre and subject of whose personality is not human; but through a true man. Two conditions, I suppose we all agree, are essential to an incarnation that really reveals God to man: one, that none other than God himself be the revealed one (that we have seen); the other, that the medium of the revelation be both divine and human. Now, the only possible way, as I conceive, for the second of these conditions to be met, without losing either the true divinity or the true humanity, is for man to be normally a creature whose life is a part of God's life,—one who is by nature divine, however that divine nature has been, in most, distorted by sin.

Jesus was a man. I cannot enlarge on that. It has usually been granted; and to doubt the true humanity of our Lord has been condemned as heresy. For all that, that very 'heresy' has passed current under the guise of orthodoxy again and again. For to be a man is, evidently, not merely to have a flesh and blood body which one who is not man may put on as a garment; but to be a man in all that we have seen that name denotes, physically and psychically, and that in the most intimate unity. It is just here—in the lack in early times of a trustworthy psychology—that one finds it impossible to follow the thought of the men who gave the doctrine of the Incarnation its first systematic form. There is no common ground on which we can stand with them. They speak a different language, and that difference is essential.

The further historic fact that Jesus was and did far more than any other man was or did, is not to be blinked at. It is to allowed its full weight. The completeness, or universality, of his character; his spiritual power, his authoritative teaching, his consciousness of his own sinlessness, his unique relation to God, his forgiveness of sin, his miracles, or signs and wonders,—all must be taken into account. And the question that follows is: Must we, because of these facts, surrender our belief in his true humanity, so dear to the religious consciousness, so essential to his sympathy with ourselves, and to the moral conquest and the saving power which we have found in the Son of Man?

The conventional answer we all are familiar with. There

were in Jesus two natures in one person. But what is one's "nature?" Put simply, the nature of a person is the characteristic way in which that person behaves. If so, to speak of two natures in one person is evidently absurd, self-contradictory. Two series of states, each consistent with itself but inconsistent with the other, imply inevitably two persons. "Nature" is not something hanging around loose, so to say,—a "mass," as the Reformed theologians put it, which the Eternal Logos could "assume." It is the mode of behavior of a person, through which alone that person is known to be a person.

Strauss has somewhere said that "The true criticism of dogma is its history." Certainly, if one follows the interminable swaying of this doctrine of the two natures in one person, from one side to the other; continually decided by church councils, but never settled; the dissenters silenced, if not by reason, then by the devious ways of the political demagogue, or the still more violent methods of the mob, yet never satisfied,—one will need to frame no other indictment against its irrationality. We may well be excused if we doubt whether the hand of God was in that fictitious 'middle way' of the orthodox Church, of which Canon—now Bishop—Gore, for instance, makes so great a boast. Here are Orthodox and Apollinarian; Antiochian and Nestorian; Monophysite and Diophysite; Monothelite and Diothelite; Adoptianist and Antiadoptianist; and even such enormities as Phthartolatae and Aphthartodoketist, Aktistetis and Ktistolator. Here is communion of attributes in one direction only, and communion of attributes in both directions. Here, the Lutheran theologian, with his distinction between local presence and illocal presence, and the Reformed theologian, with his "inexplicable" nexus joining the two natures. And here, finally, the Kenotic theology, in all its variations, in which the whole pyramid of Incarnation doctrine is made to rest, apex downwards, on a single text; and according to which, not Jesus Christ, as the text says, but a part, or person, or "distinction" of God, empties himself, not of self-glorification, as the words used would naturally seem to imply, but of such attributes as omniscience and omnipotence. Does anyone wonder that it is a chief among the Kenotic theologians (Martensen) who meets what he not unjustly calls the monstrosity of the old orthodoxy,

according to which Christ, as a child in the cradle, secretly carried on the government of the world with the omniscience which that work required, with the proposition of a double life in the one personality of the Logos; so that we have one life in God, with three personalities; and again, one of these three personalities with two lives. Or does anyone wonder that another of the kenosis theories—that of Gess—fulfills the *reductio ad absurdum* by holding that "during the time of the kenosis, the subsistence of the world in the Son, its upholding and government through the Son, is suspended."

Both on account, therefore, of its psychological contradictions and on account of its historical failure, this theory of the two natures in the one divine Person, sends one back the more eagerly to the question whether there is anything in the historic facts of Jesus' life and work that breaks down belief in his true God-related and God-filled human nature. Some of the unique facts in Jesus' life—as his spiritual power and his authoritative teaching—most of us would have no difficulty in accounting for, when the transcendent holiness of Jesus is remembered. Do those other facts—such as the forgiveness of sins and the miracles—make the problem hopeless? Certainly if we must judge the possibilities of humanity solely by our experience of human life, outside of Jesus, the answer is hopeless. But if we really believe that this world is a direct manifestation of God, in whom is nothing deeper or more essential than the Will of Love; that human nature with its relative personality is the highest level to which that manifestation has reached; and that a perfectly holy human will, freely affirming its natural identity with God in a moral and spiritual unity, becomes altogether an unhindered expression of his will,—then it seems to me reasonable to expect that holy human will to represent God very directly to his finite and sinning world, and to exercise power immeasurably beyond what is possible to human nature, as we know it apart from Jesus. At any rate, two things are sure: First, that all that Jesus was and did, his goodness and his signal power, he himself said was due to God working through him. And, second, that there is not one thing he did, not even his miracles nor his forgiveness of sins, that he did not, at one time or oftener, himself say would be possible to other men, under given condi-

tions. Would these others, then, cease to be men? If we receive the testimony at all we must receive the whole of it.

It is in accord with this that Jesus prays for his disciples, that they may be one with the Father, as he is one; says of the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, that he has given this same glory to them; and even promises that, through faith, they shall do greater things than he had done.

But what of the pre-existence which, if the representations of the Gospel of John and some of the Epistles of Paul are to be trusted, is to be ascribed to Jesus? The difficulty is a real one. But Jesus believed no less in his own personal immortality after death than before birth. And if, as we hold, his whole thought and life were dominated with the fullest, most immediate, consciousness of God, does it seem at all incredible that that which to some of us is a dim memory or guess, was to him a clear vision,—that

> "The soul that dwelleth in us, our life's star,
> Hath had elsewhere its setting, and cometh from afar."

The part in creation, ascribed by some Scriptures to Christ, I, for one, do not doubt grew out of the prevalent belief that the Absolute God was unrelated to the world, and so required a medium through whom he could create,—by which road we soon lose our human Christ altogether as they lost him in the ninth century, substituting for faith in the Savior, faith in the Virgin Mary; or as some of our twentieth century teachers have lost him, telling us that in heaven they expect to see no other God than Christ. So the cycle of drawing distinctions in the Godhead, which began with the recognition of Jesus as the exalted Messiah, becomes complete, Christ is the only God there is. And from that we come back to the point of departure,—God himself really revealed in a really human Jesus.

From this point of view, the old question, Was Christ, then, merely a man? becomes meaningless. If by "merely a man" we mean man not including Jesus,—man as we know him in ourselves, or in even the best of other persons,—then surely Jesus was not 'merely a man.' But that is to forget that, apart from Jesus, we have no induction from which to learn the unmeasured possibilities of human nature through unity with the will of God. Here, in the sphere of righteousness, perfection *is* infinity.

Therefore, without abating one jot of one's acknowledgement of the pre-eminence of Jesus Christ, or surrendering any least part of what is of vital worth in one's belief in his "proper divinity," I am persuaded that both facts and faith point to God's supreme revelation of himself to men in the Incarnation, as a revelation in and through a true man.

One belief, however, which, if it be a fact, might militate against this conclusion, is the belief that Jesus was born of a virgin mother. This is the counterpart of the essentially polytheistic theory of an incarnate Logos—if by Logos is meant, not God revealing himself through one of his human modes, but a distinct ego or person, a δεύτερος θεὸς, as Eusebius of Cesarea expressed it. To Ignatius, Irenaeus and others of the Fathers, the virgin birth *was* the incarnation. But, without denying all value to that age of such a conception, we may justly believe that the Incarnation, as a unveiling of the heart of God, and so the heart of righteousness, in the sphere of a loving human life, one with him in that deepest of all unities, the unity of a completely obedient will, is a conception that towers by majestic heights above that of a physiological enfleshing. Apart, however, from any particular interpretation of the Incarnation, it is becoming increasingly precarious to ground one's faith in the reality of the Incarnation in a belief in the historic reliability of the accounts of the virgin birth. Their present place in the manuscripts of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, certain historic references contained in them, the beauties of their stories, and the attachment of the Christian heart to them, together perhaps with a hint of the possible truth of the tradition found in the fact of parthenogenesis in some lower forms of life, seem to be the chief reasons for retaining these accounts as historical. Against doing so are all these reasons :

The absence of the story of miraculous birth from the other Gospels, even the Gospel of John, the Gospel of the Divine.

The uselessness, if Joseph were not Jesus' father, of both the genealogies given, and the fact of the discrepancies between them. It is an unsupported assumption that that of Luke refers to Mary, when not a word is said of Mary.

The apology for this lack of pertinence in the genealogies,—itself an admission of lack of sequence between alleged facts and

aim—in the words, "being the son, as was supposed, of Joseph."

The fact that the legal connection, if that were sought, would have no worth for the Incarnation.

The fact that Messianic prophecy points, nevertheless, to the Messiah's Davidic descent, and the implication of several New Testament passages that this was fulfilled through Joseph.

The testimony of the Sinaitic Syriac Manuscript, which is believed to be of early date, and says distinctly, "Joseph to whom was betrothed the Virgin Mary, begat Jesus who is called Christ."

The generally admitted priority of Mark over the Gospels that contain the accounts of the virgin birth.

The use of Isaiah 7, which had to do with the author's own day, and bore quite another meaning from that assigned.

The association of this story with other apparently legendary stories, as of The Star and The Song the Shepherds Heard.

The analogous legends respecting Gautama, Zoroaster, Plato, Augustus, and others.

The subsequent experiences of Mary with Jesus, seemingly inexplicable if she were conscious of such a miraculous origin in her son.

Mary's specific word to Jesus, "Thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing,"—a word too privately spoken to allow of explanation under the idea of public supposition as to Joseph's fatherhood.

The Apostle Paul's silence, despite his assertion of the divinity of Jesus.

The prevalence of the belief in the essential sinfulness of the flesh, and especially of natural generation.

If, then, we must hold the historicity of the account of the virgin birth to be at least very doubtful, have we lost very greatly? I believe we have, rather, gained greatly. For here we find once more the affirmation that God's highest self-revelation was made in and through one who was truly man. A man who could be born into the world under quite different hereditary conditions from our own, could have little share in that moral conflict and moral victory which is the greatest glory of Jesus Christ, and could, one thinks, be of little help to sinning men. But a man who, starting where we all started, was "tempted in

all points like as we are, yet without sin;" a man who, with a moral trembling of soul in testimony to our common humanity, could cry out of the depths of his inner struggle, "Now is my soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify thy name;" a man, in a word, who saves the world because, for love's sake, he first won in himself,—he can reveal the love of God to men in compelling power, he can be a Savior and a Life-giver beyond all words precious to struggling, sinning, suffering men.

"Conjecture of the worker by the work:
Is there strength there? Enough. Intelligence?
Ample. But goodness in a like degree?
Not to the human eye in the present state,
An isoscele deficient in the base.
What lacks, then, of perfection fit for God
But just the instance which this tale supplies
Of love without a limit? So is strength,
So is intelligence; let love be so,
Unlimited in its self-sacrifice,
Then is the tale true, and God shows complete."

WHY BE A MINISTER?

FERDINAND Q. BLANCHARD, '01.

THE outcome of the present day discussion of the question Is the number of men entering the ministry as a life work declining? seems to be a tolerably assured answer in the affirmative. Regarding the causes which make this true, there is, however, much divergence of opinion. Hence, unless we are to leave matters to work out themselves, we must discover if possible where the real difficulty lies. Probably no one explanation covers all the cases where men, who under the conditions of a generation ago would have chosen the ministry, do not do so today. This fraction of truth which lurks perchance in each of the several opinions offered, only gives greater justification to

any attempt to discover a really central reason for the smaller number of students now annually graduated from our divinity schools.

When we turn to the explanations most prominenty brought forward, we find at once that some of them stand wide of the mark. Many say, for example, that it is a question of pay. Yet there is surely a plenty of young men today who, imbued with the high ideals imparted by modern college life, can never be said to stay out of the ministry merely because unwilling to face the possibility of only a living wage throughout life. Again, it is claimed that the checks which the church puts upon freedom of thought are responsible for the lack of more candidates for her ministry. But, clearly, in this era of truth, the fear of intellectual restraint no longer proves a barrier. Even in certain communions strongly evangelical there is complete liberty. The true difficulty is rather one which has been touched upon often in an incidental way, but never given the full and, so it seems to the writer, well nigh supreme place it deserves. We refer to the failure to put a distinctive emphasis upon the value of human souls and upon the Christian ministry as offering the one great opportunity to influence most powerfully the spiritual life of men. This it is which proved so vital in former days, and here is revealed the one need of the present.

In the valedictory discourse of Dr. Theodore Cuyler to the Lafayette Avenue Church at the close of a ministry of forty-four years, occur these words: "And I fearlessly declare that when the most splendid talent has reached the loftiest round on the ladder of promotion, that round is many rungs lower than a pulpit in which a consecrated tongue proclaims a living Christianity to a dying world. What Lord Eldon from the bar, what Webster from the senate chamber, what Sir Walter Scott from the realms of romance, what Darwin from the field of science, what monarch from Wall street or Lombard street, can carry his laurels or his gold up to the judgment seat and say, 'These are my crown?' The laurels and the gold will be dust and ashes. But if so humble a servant of Jesus Christ as your pastor can ever point to the gathered flock in white before the celestial throne, then he may say, 'What is my hope, or joy, or crown of rejoicing? Are not even ye in the presence of Christ at his coming?'"

If a man believed that, is it any wonder that he chose the ministry, provided he once felt assured of the capability to perform its soul-winning work. But how widely does such a conception prevail now? Certainly ministers in active service meet with it all too rarely. Now never can we go back to the old distinctions suggested in the quotation. But may we not, should we not, realize that the ministry offers one superlative opportunity which can be found in no other line of human activity, the opportunity, namely, to profoundly affect and vitally influence the spiritual life of men and women. In other words, the Christian pastor above every other man has the chance to bring his powers, little or great, to bear directly upon human souls.

In contrast with this conception of the ministry, think for a moment of our views to-day. See how we have infinitely widened the scope of ministerial activity and made it include much that, fifty years ago, was not dreamed of as having any connection with the church. The church, we hear it said, must care for the body and mind, not less than the soul. The minister must shoulder the burden of social clubs, lecture classes, bowling alleys and gymnasiums, giving to these an importance equal to services for worship and spiritual illumination. But what does this all mean? Nothing other, indeed, than that the minister has turned aside from what is distinctive in his calling; he has entered upon work which the members of his parish can do perhaps better than he, work which the layman may readily accomplish outside the hours of regular business. What wonder then that with this blotting out of emphasis upon the unique privilege and duty of the ministry in the cure of souls there should be a lessening of the number who enter its ranks.

In the light, therefore, of these facts, it behooves the church to do two things if the diminishing ranks of her ministers are to be made good. First, it should reiterate with renewed insistence the words of one who, beholding the exceeding and final insufficiency of all other concerns, declared, "There is a spirit in man." For, in our desire not to slight any element in human life, we have lost sight of the intrinsic worth of the soul. And secondly, the church must further reassert its paramount duty to cherish and develop this soul-life whose value it has thus placed above every thing else. When the church does these two things, the

minister will not be expected to spend his time in nursing fertile schemes for filling his church with people whose chief hunger is for seven days of amusement instead of only six. On the contrary it will be expected chiefly that he know Jesus Christ intimately, that he be a familiar friend with the saints and heroes of the past, and that through his fellowship with them and through his constant endeavor to understand God and the divine plans for the world, he come with something of value to say to human souls. Then, and only then, will the Christian minister be true to his own distinctive work, true to his unique responsibility and blessed opportunity.

Need it be said that what we here propose does not mean a narrowing or limitation of the ministerial calling. If there is doubt upon this point read again the life of Phillips Brooks. Indeed no person needs to make more his own the old Latin motto *Nihil humanum a me alienum est*, than he who would affect the spiritual life of men and herald the Gospel message to needy souls. In no sense will there be restriction if the church with reconsecrated fervor exalts as the all important work of her ministry the direct nurture of her spiritual life. Nor would we be thought to pass criticism upon such "institutional work" as often falls to the necessary charge of the Christian pastor. Only, the ultimate aim must always be to quicken other organizations or instrumentalities to take these duties in hand, that the minister may not long be hampered in the fulfillment of his unique office.

The bearing of this proposal for the church upon the number entering the ministry is already evident. The church and her present ministry must dare to advance on the assumption that men really want from them first and most of all the message which makes belief in God stronger and the path of duty clearer. We must realize, anew perhaps, that to the church and those who serve her is given the sublime duty of bringing mankind to see that the final worth of temporal things is their power to shape an eternal life. To emphasize the supreme privilege of the Christian ministry, and that too, with no disparagement to the sacred character of other kinds of work done in the honest desire to serve God; to insist that the organization of a gymnasium is no substitute for helping men know God better or for declaring spiritual truth to souls feeling after fellowship with things divine; to make

thus clear the real function of the minister, is to hold before young men asking seriously as to their life-work, the vision of a sphere of such unequalled influence and power that its appeal will prove well nigh irresistible. Nor can we doubt, when the spiritual aspects of the Christian ministry are thus made most vital, that there will be won to its service all whom it needs.

SUGGESTIONS FOR A COURSE OF READING ON THE DOCTRINE OF ATONEMENT.

PROFESSOR GEORGE B. STEVENS.

THE theories of atonement from Anselm (1033-1109) onward may be conveniently divided into eight types. Frequently, in individual authors, the principles of more than one theory may be found, sometimes quite incongruously combined. Particularly in some recent books will a mixture of penal, governmental and mystical elements be noted. In the following classification the modified penal satisfaction and the ethicized governmental categories will be found to be the most indefinite.

I have placed under each heading from one to five essays or treatises which would prove sufficient to acquaint one with the type in question, and have put in parentheses a few explanatory and other suggestions. Under each heading I have intimated what is the central idea, or most prominent note, of the theory in question.

1. The Commercial, or, perhaps, better named, the Feudal or Chivalric theory. God conceived after the analogy of a feudal lord or private dignitary; atonement a reparation for sin conceived now as a robbery, now as an insult.

Anselm, *Cur Deus Homo?* (Eng. trans. by S. N. Deane, Chicago, 1903.)

2. The Penal Satisfaction or Vicarious Punishment theory. God conceived as a Judge who must and does punish all sin,

either personally or vicariously. [Developed in the writings of the Reformers and, especially, by their 17th century successors.]

Charles Hodge, *Systematic Theology*. W. G. T. Shedd, Essay on *Atonement* in *Theol. Essays* (and relevant parts of his *Dogmatic Theology*).

A. H. Strong, *Systematic Theology*.

3. Modified Penal theory. Christ's sufferings penal "so to speak" or "so far as possible"—quasi-penal views, shading off into the governmental, or even approximating the moral theory.

R. W. Dale, *The Atonement*.

James Orr, *Christian View of God and the World*.

D. W. Forrest, *The Christ of History and of Experience*.

James Denney, *Studies in Theology* (also *The Death of Christ* and *The Atonement and the Modern Mind*).

Arthur Lyttelton, in *Lux Mundi* (a composite exposition—might, perhaps as appropriately, have been placed under 5 or 7).

4. The Governmental theory. God conceived as a moral Ruler who must safeguard the interests of his law. Christ's death a "penal example," a satisfaction not to retributive, but to rectoral justice.

Hugo Grotius, *On the Satisfaction of Christ* (trans. and ed. by F. H. Foster. Andover, 1889).

J. Edwards, Sr. *On the Satisfaction of Christ*. [This Essay exhibits a mingling of Anselmic, penal satisfaction, Grotian and moral influence elements.]

The Atonement. Ed. by E. A. Park (Boston, 1859). A series of Essays by various New England divines.

[The Governmental, or Grotian theory is illustrated, in general, by Arminian theology, *e. g.* Watson's *Institutes*, and was held, with modifications, by most New England theologians from Edwards onward, *e. g.* Bellamy, Hopkins, J. Edwards, Jr., Emmons, N. W. Taylor, S. Harris and L. F. Stearns. The later writers, however, tend towards, or illustrate, the next type.]

5. Ethicized Governmentalism, a construction of the Grotian view in the direction of a more mystical or ethical explanation, often due to the adoption of some such guiding principle as: the Fatherhood of God, or: the Kingdom of God.

J. S. Lidgett, *The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement*.

W. L. Walker, *The Cross and the Kingdom.*

H. C. Sheldon, *System of Christian Doctrine.*

6. The theory of Vicarious Repentance or Expiatory Confession made by Christ on our behalf.

J. M. Campbell, *The Nature of the Atonement.*

R. C. Moberly, *Atonement and Personality.*

7. Mystical theories, which represent Christ as in some sense including us, and describe him as the sum, root or recapitulation of humanity.

F. D. Maurice, *Theological Essays*, and *The Doctrine of Sacrifice.*

A. H. Strong, *Christ in Creation and Ethical Monism* (later writings).

R. W. Dale, *Atonement* (closing chapters).

8. The Moral, or "Moral Influence," or "Subjective" theory, which discards commercial and legal analogies and seeks to interpret the work of Christ in terms of personal relationship and influence and to show how he introduces men into the life of sonship to God.

Horace Bushnell, Essay in *God in Christ.* [His views are further elaborated, with considerable admixture of Grotian and other elements, in *Vicarious Sacrifice* and *Forgiveness and Law.*]

B. Jowett, Essay on *Atonement and Satisfaction* in *St. Paul's Epistles.*

W. N. Clarke, *Outline of Christian Theology.*

T. V. Tymms, *The Christian Idea of Atonement.*

A. Sabatier, *The Doctrine of Atonement.*

If one wishes, with the least waste of time and energy, to acquaint himself with the various theories, he could do so by reading six or eight of the authors above named, *e. g.* Anselm, Shedd, Dale, Grotius, Lidgett, Campbell or Moberly, and Clarke or Tymms or Walker.

The treatise of Dr. Tymms (Macmillan, 1904) is the latest work on the subject and the most systematic exposition and defence of the moral theory.

Yale Divinity Quarterly.

GEORGE H. DRIVER, '05, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF.
OSCAR E. MAURER, '06, ASSOCIATE EDITOR.
WILFRID A. ROWELL, '06, ASSISTANT EDITOR.
ALBERT E. RORABACK, '05, ALUMNI EDITOR.

PROF. FRANK C. PORTER, PH.D., FACULTY ADVISOR.

MARION L. BURTON, '06, BUSINESS MANAGER, 63 Clark St., New Haven, Conn.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, 50 CENTS A YEAR
if paid prior to Jan. first. Otherwise, 75 cents a year. Single copies, 20 cents.

The date upon a subscriber's address, indicates the expiration of his subscription. It will be assumed that a continuation is desired unless notice to the contrary is received Address ALL communications to the YALE DIVINITY QUARTERLY, Box 917, Yale Station, New Haven, Conn.

Just as we go to press, we learn with heartfelt regret of Dean Sanders' resignation as dean and professor, to take effect August, 1905. He accepts a call to act in the newly constituted office of General Secretary of the Congregational Sunday School and Publishing Society. We are glad to know that he will retain some connection with the Divinity School and will lecture next year on religious pedagogics. A fuller announcement must await the May issue.

The subject of tuition at divinity schools has again been raised. In certain quarters, the opinion has been expressed that a policy of no tuition fee for theological students must foster a less manly and less intellectual type of minister, and is therefore wrong in principle. But does such a position take account of the fact that students in general pay no more than one-third of the full cost of their education? At Yale "the average undergraduate receives between $9 and $10 in return for $6 which he pays out. Other actual items would undoubtedly run the ratio up to two to one, and this would be increased greatly were Yale lands and certain buildings to be capitalized at cost and interest computed on the sum." These figures are readily paralleled in other institutions of higher learning. There is, therefore, no "gulf fixed" between theological students and students in general. All are relatively dependent or indebted for their education. We would suggest, then, that criticism of the sort quoted may fairly originate only from those who have paid *full* tuition, tuition actually covering the cost of their instruction, or else from those who wish to include the whole system of modern college and university education under opprobrious censure for belittling the manhood and intelligence of those whom it chooses to graduate. The matter at Yale rests for the present where it was; the Corporation voted no change at their annual meeting in February.

G. H. D.

THE DEAN'S LETTER.

The good effect of an newly established guest room at the School is beginning to be apparent. It is of great advantage to our lecturers and our visitors to have both a quiet refuge and a place for talking with such men as they wish to meet.

The faculty have not been idle these weeks. Professor Stevens has just visited the Congregational Theological College of Montreal, making a number of addresses, Professor Brastow spent several days in February at the celebration of the one hundredth anniversary of his old and much beloved church at Burlington, Vt., taking a leading part there. Professor Curtis is executing a commission to write comments on the Book of Joel for an English Commentary on the whole Bible, Professor Porter has been putting through the press his "Messages of the Apocalyptical Writers" which has just been published by Scribners', and Professor Walker has been addressing various clubs, Congregational and otherwise, besides making a very strong address on the ministry at the convention in Boston of the Religious Education Association.

Professor Bacon is putting in all his available time in preparing for his anticipated year in Palestine as director of the American School of Oriental Studies in Jerusalem. The Divinity School is highly honored by his selection for this important and responsible post.

The newly elected General Secretary of the R. E. A., President Clifford W. Barnes, Ph.D., is a Yale Divinity graduate of 1892. Professor Clyde W. Votaw, Ph.D., Yale Divinity, 1891, has been from its inception the most important member of its executive staff. We all rejoice at the large share Yale has taken in the inauguration of so far reaching and beneficient a movement.

The faculty have been considering with great care this term a number of important problems, such as the wisdom of charging a tuition fee in the theological department, the granting of the degree of B.D. without requiring Hebrew, and the extent to which graduate courses should be pushed. We practically come to this conclusion that no institution can do its work scientifically and progressively without an increase of its resources. Financial stringency blocks all rapid advance. F. K. S.

MARQUAND CHAPEL NOTES.

Dr. C. H. Patton, Home Secretary of the American Board, spoke on the topic "What it is to be a Missionary Pastor." The first necessity was to keep intelligent in regard to the foreign missionary work. In order to

do this the pastor must read the missionary periodicals. Dr. Patton's personal experience in this regard is valuable. He said that while a pastor he carried the "Missionary Herald" in his pocket and read it at odd times while waiting in railroad stations and in parlors. The next thing for the pastor to do is to present the great facts about missions to his congregation. The reality of missions must be kept before the people. The frequent use of mission field facts and heroism as illustrations in the sermon in a forceful way accomplished this result. The pastor must teach his church to contribute liberally and systematically to missions.

Prof. Brastow emphasized the value and power of the present revival spirit, now springing up afresh, in its relation to the young minister about to enter a new field of labor. It is a minister's duty to bring every human being to a definite purpose to serve Christ. The evangelistic spirit alone will enable him to do this work successfully. This spirit will help him also to organize his parish, to bind other strong personalities to him for effective service. The great unused potentialities of the church should be utilized by the minister. The evangelistic spirit will also lend power to the conduct of public worship and to the direction of the worship toward educational ends.

Dr. Leonard Bacon spoke of some of the causes of failure in preaching. One is a lack of confidence in the message and a lack of confidence in the willingness of people to hear it. Too often the preacher feels that he must resort to unusual and startling methods of speech in order to secure attention. On the contrary a calm assurance of the willingness of the people to hear would give help and strength to the preaching. A second cause of failure is an unwillingness to be commonplace,—to reiterate commonplace things. The ability to do this last is a great element in success. It is the minister's duty to say over and over again in simple language the same old truths and principles.

Prof. Walker gave a brief report of the Religious Education Convention and followed it with some suggestive remarks on the educational work and function of the pastor. The Christian Church is a great center of religious education under the direction of the pastor. The teaching functions of the pastorate have enlarged during the past few years. The doctrinal sermon as a method of teaching the great truths of Christianity is a necessity. Large attention should be given to the Sunday School. The pastor should be the Superintendent of the Sunday School or at least the Superintendent of the Superintendent. The prayer meeting should be used as a place for instruction in religious and ethical questions as well as in the practical application of Christianity.

Other speakers have been Rev. DeWolf Perry, Rev. Frederick Lent, Rev. Frank R. Luckey, and Dr. H. A. Stimson who delivered a course of lectures upon "The Church in Modern Life." W. A. R.

SEMINARY NEWS.

THE COMING CONFERENCE.—As announced in the last Quarterly, steps have been taken to hold a Conference in Yale University, under the auspices of the Divinity Students, at which the claims of the Ministry as a profession will be presented to the upper classmen of the various colleges of New England and the adjoining states. The date for the conference is March 31 and April 1 and 2. This is the first in a series of annual conferences to be held by Yale, Hartford and Union Seminaries in rotation. The following is the conference program:

FRIDAY, March 31, 8 P. M. Dwight Hall. Opening Session: Address of Welcome, Dean Sanders. Address, "The Opportunities of the Ministry of Today." Lyman Abbott, D.D.

9:15. Trowbridge Library. The Yale Divinity School will entertain delegates and friends at an informal reception.

SATURDAY MORNING, 10 o'clock. Marquand Chapel. Address, "The Ministry and Young Men." Rev. Edward F. Sanderson, Pastor Central Congregational Church, Providence, R. I.

Address, "The Ministry and the Working Man." Rev. H. Roswell Bates, Pastor Spring Street Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Address, "The Ministry in a Historic Church." Rev. Rockwell H. Potter, Minister of the First Church of Christ, Hartford, Conn.

SATURDAY AFTERNOON will be given up to visiting the various departments and collections of Yale University, and the religious and philanthropic institutions, and the places of historic interest in New Haven. Guides will be furnished.

SATURDAY EVENING, 8 o'clock. Dwight Hall. Address, "The Ministry as a calling for men of Missionary Zeal." Rev. George W. Knox, D.D., Professor of Philosophy, Union Theological Seminary.

Address, "The Ministry as a Calling for Men of Scholarship." Rev. Melancthon W. Jacobus, Dean of the Hartford Theological Seminary.

SUNDAY MORNING, 10:30 o'clock. The Conference will attend Battell Chapel for Morning Worship and Communion. The Preacher will be Rev. Henry Sloane Coffin, of New York City.

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, 3:30 o'clock. Marquand Chapel. Address, "The Ministry as a field of Influence." Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., Secretary of Yale University.

Address, "The Joys of the Ministry." Rev. Artemas Haynes, Pastor of the United Church, New Haven, Conn.

SUNDAY EVENING. Dwight Hall. Address, "The Need of Men." John R. Mott.

All visiting delegates will be entertained during their stay in New Haven. Other Seminaries throughout the country have been notified of this event, and have been urged to hold similar conferences. Readers of the QUARTERLY can help in making this event a success by sending the names of young men who have not yet chosen their life work, and whose attendance upon this conference might be secured. O. E. M.

ALUMNI NOTES.

OBITUARIES.

'58—Rev. Moses Smith died at Chicago, Nov. 30, 1904.

'82—Rev. E. H. Ashmun died Dec. 21, 1904, at aged of 51.

Since December the following changes have taken place:

'73—Rev. Charles W. Fitch accepts call to Langsburg and Victor, Mich.——Rev. A. L. Reed called to Pilgrim Church, Madison, Wis.

'75—Rev. J. A. Freeman resigns Woodbury, Vt.

'77—Rev. Francis T. Lee accepts call to Maywood, Ill.

'78—Rev. John W. Best accepts Bethesda Church, Chicago, Ill.

'79—Rev. E. Clarence Oakley resigns Royal Oak, Mich.——Rev. Wm. A. Remele accepts Waitsfield, Vt.

'80—Rev. James O. Emerson resigns Elburn, Ill.

'81—Rev. Jabez Backus accepts Elizabethtown, N. Y.

'82—Rev. C. H. Peck resigns Bennington, Vt.

'84—Rev. David C. Reid accepts call to Wood Memorial Church, Cambridge, Mass.

'88—Rev. C. A. Dinsmore accepts call to First Church, Waterbury, Conn.

'90—Rev. C. N. Severance accepts Nyack, N. Y.

'93—Rev. John L. Keedy accepts call to N. Andover, Mass.——Rev. W. R. Stewart becomes missionary in Vermont under C. S. S. and Pub. Society.

'94—Rev. August F. Fehlandt accepts West Salem, Wis.

'95—Rev. J. B. Kettle accepts call to Tabernacle Church, St. Joseph, Mo.

'96—Rev. Thomas Henshaw accepts Windham, Ohio.

AN ALL-ROUND NEW ENGLANDER.*

Quoth Massachusetts,—"Fisher's mine.
Connecticut, let go!
A mother's right, I claim to-night,
He's mine; he'll tell you so.

"In Norfolk, nigh to Middlesex,
His childhood drank the day.
Not far from home my State-house dome;
Not far my Plymouth Bay."

Broke in Rhode Island: "Sister mine,
Forgive me, but I must
The truth repeat. From off his feet
He shook your sacred dust;

* Poem read by Rev. William R. Huntington, D.D., at the banquet tendered to Prof. Fisher, May 20, 1902, at the time of his retirement from active duties on the Yale Divinity School faculty.

"Left Harvard, Amherst, Williams far
Behind him, and came down,
Preferring still the Roger Will-
iams atmosphere of Brown.

And though I cannot but confess
Maternal claims are thine;
Pray don't be hurt, if I assert
Alma-maternal mine."

"Hush, Little Rhody! Well you know
That, having drunk his fill,
He straight returned to where there burned
That light upon a hill,

Which Moses kindled, Leonard fanned,
And Park, (who raised the breeze,)
Though now, alas, 'tis like to pass,
Extinguished 'twixt two C's."

At this, Connecticut took fire.
"Good sisters, not too fast!
For all your pains, the fact remains,
Yale tethered him at last.

"Here Clio met him; touched his lips;
And to that steadfast eye
Bade Time unroll the pictured scroll
Of centuries gone by.

Finis coronat opus,—yes,
That tests a man's career.
Have done your praise of 'prentice days,
Behold, the master here!"

An awkward silence gloomed the feast,
The sisters sat distrait;
When all aloft came sudden-soft,
A breath from far away.

A fragrance as of balsam fire,
A murmur as of rills,
A rippling laugh that gathered half
The music of the hills.

Out spoke the Pine-tree State,—"That voice
I know as 'twere mine own.
Dear sisters three, give ear with me,
Mt. Desert's on the 'phone.

"Yes, I'm Mt. Desert. Hold the wire.
I merely rang to say,
That Fisher's mine by right divine;
For here he's come to stay.

Moreover, would you learn to know
Your Fisher through and through;—
Not know in part, but know by heart,
There's this one thing to do.

"Come sail with him the purple seas
That wash my caverned shore.
Come bask awhile on Cranberry Isle,
And list the breakers' roar.

"Come paddle with him on the pond,
Come pic-nic by the beach,
On wooded walk attend his talk,
And marvel at its reach.

"And would you learn how children rate
This scholar, this divine;—
The rocky stair go climb to where
His sun-set windows shine."

"Central! Hullo! You've cut me off!"
So ends your poet's strain.
'Tis your demand he show his hand?
Well then,—he sides with Maine. W. R. H.

PHELPS, PHOTOGRAPHER

To Class 1905, Yale Divinity School.

Telephone.—— 942 CHAPEL STREET.

The Aim of the A-R-E SIX'S Wise Investor

Is immediate and steady income, plus ample security. Both qualities are found in A-R E SIX'S.

AN INTEREST-BEARING SECURITY based upon carefully selected New York City real estate is a rational investment. It always pays, and it does not hazard the money invested. A-R-E SIX'S have paid 6 per cent. steadily for seventeen years to thousands of investors.

THE BEST SECURITY ON EARTH is earth itself—real estate—above all, New York City real estate; and it is this security—millions of dollars' worth of it—including over six miles of lot frontage at stations of the new Subway and other rapid transit lines, which secures A-R-E SIX'S.

SIX PER CENT BONDS principal and interest guaranteed by Assets of over $7,000,000, including Capital and surplus of over $1,100,000. Interest semi-annually by coupons payable at Chemical National Bank, New York. Negotiable and transferable, in amount to suit. Liberal withdrawal privileges.

Map of New York City, showing the location of the various properties along the Subway, and other circulars with full particulars, on request. Write today.

American Real Estate Co., Dun Building, New York City.

CHAS. L. PEASE, Special Agent,
805 FIRST NAT'L BANK BLDG, New Haven, Conn.

E. M. BRADLEY, M. C. BRADLEY, H. E. McCABE.

BRADLEY'S NEW ENGLAND KITCHEN,

90-92 MEADOW ST., NEW HAVEN, CONN. Two Blocks from Union Station.

NEVER CLOSED.

A Lunch and Grill Room for Ladies and Gentlemen. A special quick service a la carte dinner. All pastry served is made on the premises. Drinking water filtered by the most scientifically perfect water filter in the city.

Hygienically Cooked Food. A private dining room for class suppers. You see the Cooking Done.

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNION SERVICE

Choice designs in several materials, including silver. Send for Catalogue (D 2) and full particulars.

"Our people are delighted with your Individual Communion Set here in Detroit as they were in my former parish, the First Baptist Church, Worcester, Mass."—*Spencer B. Meeser, D. D.*

"Admirable in design, splendid workmanship, serviceable material."—*R. N. Simms, Raleigh, N. C.*

'Your service is the simplest, neatest, easily and surely handled."—*F. P. Shumway, Boston.*

"More and more convinced that this selection was of the best."—*Alexander Lewis, Worcester.*

GEO. H. SPRINGER, Manager, 256 and 258 WASHINGTON ST., Boston, Mass.

H. F. SMITH. FRANK MURRAY.

SMITH & MURRAY,

—TAILORS—

24 CENTER STREET. NEW HAVEN, CONN.

FINE TAILORING AT POPULAR PRICES.

DIVINITY BOOK ROOM, CO-OPERATIVE

Text Books used in Regular Courses. General Theological and Religious Books. Stationery, Fountain Pens, Etc.

ALUMNI: Out of town orders receive prompt attention.

OSCAR E. MAURER, M'g'r.

The Randall Studio We do artistic work for a critical public. 17 Highest Awards in Europe and America.

SPECIAL RATES TO SENIORS.

1062-1064 Chapel Street. NEW HAVEN, CONN.

ARTHUR M. ROSENBERG, TAILOR

1014 CHAPEL STREET, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

WEINBERG,

1048 CHAPEL STREET,

OPPOSITE VANDERBILT HALL.

TELEPHONE 1695-3.